



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,647	11/18/2003	Gary S. Firestein	UCSD1160-4	7684
28213	7590	03/27/2007	EXAMINER	
DLA PIPER US LLP 4365 EXECUTIVE DRIVE SUITE 1100 SAN DIEGO, CA 92121-2133			WEHBE, ANNE MARIE SABRINA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/27/2007	PAPER*	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/716,647	FIRESTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Anne Marie S. Wehbe	Art Unit 1633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 32-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 40,42,44 and 45 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 32-39,41 and 43 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                        |                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.                                     |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.                                                           | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                         |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's amendment and response to the restriction requirement received on 12/19/06 has been entered. Claims 1-31 have been canceled and new claims 32-45 have been entered. Claims 32-45 are now pending in the instant application.

The original claims and thus the inventions identified in the restriction requirement mailed on 6/27/06 were drawn to method claims. The applicant states that instead of choosing one of the inventions listed in the restriction requirement, they are exercising their right to claim another invention based on claims added before a first action on the merits has been prepared, citing MPEP 818.02(a). The applicant states that new claims 32-45 are drawn to the new invention, but that if a new restriction is required based on these new claims, that the composition of claims 32-43 is elected without traverse. The applicant has also responded to the election of species requirement presented in the previous office action and has elected without traverse a) a nucleic acid encoding p53, and b) rheumatoid arthritis.

In response, new claims 32-45 comprise two separately patentable inventions. Claims 32-43 are drawn to a composition comprising a nucleic acid molecule encoding a polypeptides that promotes apoptosis, where as claims 44-45 are drawn to methods for promoting apoptosis in synoviocytes in an inflamed joint in a mammal comprising administering a nucleic acid molecule encoding a polypeptides that promotes apoptosis. Claims 44-45 correspond loosely to invention I as identified in the restriction requirement., classified in class 514, subclass 44. The composition claims, claims 32-43 represent a new invention, invention IV, classified in class 435, subclass 320.1. Inventions I and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be

shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product **or** (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the nucleic acid molecule can be used in a variety of methods, including in vitro cell culture to produce the encoded protein, and in vivo methods of treating cancer. As such, the search for the structure of the composition, a nucleic acid encoding a polypeptide that promotes apoptosis does not require a search for the methods of invention I. Thus, the search and examination of both inventions is not coextensive and it would place an undue burden on the examiner to search and examine both inventions together.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, different classification, and different search requirements, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully

Art Unit: 1633

examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Therefore, based on applicant's election without traverse of the composition of claims 32-43, and the species a) a nucleic acid encoding p53, and b) rheumatoid arthritis, claims 40, 42, and 44-45 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention and/or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 12/19/06. Claims 32-39, 41, and 43 are currently under consideration. An action on the merits follows.

*Drawings*

A new corrected drawing for Figure 1 in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) is required in this application because Figure 1 is so dark as to be illegible. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

## **INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES**

### **Replacement Drawing Sheets**

Drawing changes must be made by presenting replacement sheets which incorporate the desired changes and which comply with 37 CFR 1.84. An explanation of the changes made must be presented either in the drawing amendments section, or remarks, section of the amendment paper. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). A replacement sheet must include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of the amended drawing(s) must not be labeled as "amended." If the changes to the drawing figure(s) are not accepted by the examiner, applicant will be notified of any required corrective action in the next Office action. No further drawing submission will be required, unless applicant is notified.

Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and within the top margin.

### **Annotated Drawing Sheets**

A marked-up copy of any amended drawing figure, including annotations indicating the changes made, may be submitted or required by the examiner. The annotated drawing sheet(s) must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Sheet" and must be presented in the amendment or remarks section that explains the change(s) to the drawings.

### **Timing of Corrections**

Applicant is required to submit acceptable corrected drawings within the time period set in the Office action. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings MUST be filed within the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period set for reply in the "Notice of Allowability." Extensions of time may NOT be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability.

***Priority***

Applicant's preliminary amendment filed on 11/18/03 amended the first paragraph on page 1 of the specification to correct the priority information. However, while the specification now indicates that this application is a continuation of U.S. Serial No. 09/363,997, the paragraph does not include the information that the 09/363, 997 application has issued as a U.S. Patent. Appropriate correction is required.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed 11/18/03 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires the following: (1) a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office; (2) U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications listed in a section separately from citations of other documents; (3) the application number of the application in which the information disclosure statement is being submitted on each page of the list; (4) a column that provides a blank space next to each document to be considered, for the examiner's initials; and (5) a heading that clearly indicates

Art Unit: 1633

that the list is an information disclosure statement. The information disclosure statement has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

The information disclosure statement filed by the applicant refers the examiner to parent application 09/363,997 and then provides copies of PTO-892 and PTO-1449 forms from parent applications 09/363,997, and 08/705,243. These forms do not identify the instant application, and do not provide any blank space for the examiner to initial to indicate consideration of each reference. Further, the PTO-1449 forms contain initials, signatures, and dates from previous examiners in the parent cases.

Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 32-39, 41, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,747,469 (1998), hereafter referred to as Roth et al. The applicant claims a composition formulated for administration into an arthritic or inflamed joint in a mammalian subject comprising a nucleic acid molecule with a sequence encoding a polypeptides that promotes apoptosis, where the nucleic acid molecule encodes p53. The applicant further claims said composition where the nucleic acid molecule is in an expression vector operably linked to a promoter that promotes expression of the encoded polypeptide in fibroblast-like synoviocytes, and more specifically, where the vector is a viral vector, or replication deficient adenovirus.

Regarding the intended use for the composition “for administration into an arthritic or inflamed joint in a mammalian subject”. It is noted that the use of a product for a particular purpose is not afforded patentable weight in a product claim where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the structural limitations are able to stand alone. The MPEP states that, “.. in apparatus, article, and composition claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.” *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963)(MPEP 2111.02).

Roth et al. teaches an replication deficient adenoviral vector comprising a nucleic acid sequence encoding wild type p53 formulated for *in vivo* administration to subjects with pharmaceutically acceptable carriers (Roth et al., abstract, columns 6-7 bridging paragraph, and column 9). Roth et al. further teaches that the p53 sequence is operably linked to a constitutive promoter such as the CMV, RSV, or SV40 promoters (Roth et al., column 6, lines 48-56). Note that as constitutive promoters, these promoters can express p53 in fibroblast-like synoviocytes.

Thus, by teaching the exact structure of the composition recited in the claims, Roth et al. anticipates the instant invention as claimed.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Anne Marie S. Wehbé, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0737. If the examiner is not available, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach, can be reached at (571) 272-0739. For all official communications, **the new technology center fax number is (571) 273-8300**. Please note that all official communications and responses sent by fax must be directed to the technology center fax number. For informal, non-official communications only, the examiner's direct fax number is (571) 273-0737. For any inquiry of a general nature, please call (571) 272-0547.

The applicant can also consult the USPTO's Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) on the internet for patent application status and history information, and for electronic images of applications. For questions or problems related to PAIR, please call the USPTO Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) toll free at 1-866-217-9197. Representatives are available daily from 6am to midnight (EST). When calling please have your application serial number or patent number available. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO call center (UCC) at 1-800-786-9199.

Dr. A.M.S. Wehbé

ANNE M. WEHBE PH.D  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

